Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-31 are pending and stand rejected.

By this amendment, claims 1-2, 8-9, 15 and 19 are amended.

No new matter is presented by the claim amendments. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the original specification and, for example, in the original specification at page 17, lines 1-10.

Rejection of Claims 1-29 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, at page 2, claims 1-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigehashi (Japanese Patent Publication No. JP 2003046539) in view Blankenship (US Patent Publication No. 2007/0264971).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is directed to an inter-router adjustment method, and recites:

> ... requesting router status information of router devices belonging to a common network, the router devices connected to external networks, respectively, the external networks being different from each other ...
>
> ... the router status information including at least line status information indicating a status of a respective physical link of the external networks to the respective router device so that the router devices belonging to the common sub-network operate as one virtual router device ...

That is, the router devices are connected to different external networks, respectively. Moreover, the line status information indicates a status of a respective physical link of the external networks to the respective router device. For example, in Fig. 1 of the present application router devices 21 and 22 are connected to different external networks via different physical links. The priority of the respective router device is calculated based on the line status of the respective physical link. (See the present specification at page 24, line 21 to page 25, line 20.)

Shigehashi Reference

Shigehashi is concerned with the switching of router devices based on, for example, a CPU activity ratio. In the Office Action, at page 3, the Examiner acknowledges that Shigehashi does not explicitly teach "*the router status information including at least line status information indicating a status of the physical link to the respective router device so that the router devices belonging to the common sub-network operate as one virtual router device.*" Applicants agree with the Examiner and further submit that Shigehashi does not disclose or suggest that router devices are connected to external networks respectively such that the external networks are different from each other and that the line status information indicates a status of a respective physical link of the external networks to the respective router device. This is because, as the Examiner appeared to acknowledge, Shigehashi is silent regarding line status information indicating anything regarding physical links to the respective router device.

Blankenship Reference

The addition of Blankenship does not overcome the deficiencies of Shigehashi. This is because, Blankenship does not disclose or suggest "the router status information including at least line status information indicating a status of a respective physical link of the external networks to the respective router device," as required by claim 1. Instead, Blankenship discloses a base transceiver site (BTS) 200. The BTS 200 of Blankenship includes two routers 300a and 300b (generally referred to as routers 300). Each router 300 is coupled to backhaul link 106 by connection 208a and 208b, respectively, via coupler 209. (See Blankenship at paragraph [0024].) That is, Blankenship discloses that multiple routers 300a and 300b are provided such that they are coupled to a single physical link. (i.e., backhaul link 106) (See Blankenship at paragraph [0005].) In Blankenship, each of the routers 300a and 300b may monitor performance parameters including, for example, component status, temperature, rate of dropped packets, packet latency and check sum failure. The parameters disclosed in Blankenship, however, are not concerned with "line status information indicating a status of a respective physical link of the external networks to the respective router device," as required by claim 1. This is because, Blankenship teaches that each router device 300a and 300b monitors its own information to determine a performance parameter for itself. (See Blankenship at paragraph [0047].) Because the external physical link recited in claim 1 (i.e., corresponding to

backhaul link 106 of Blankenship) is common to both router devices 300a and 300b, Blankenship has no need for monitoring such information for switching between router device 300a and 300b. This is because, the priorities based on such a physical link would be the same for both routers 300a and 300b.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Shigehashi in view of Blankenship for at least the above-mentioned reasons.

Claims 2, 8-9, 15 and 19

Claims 2, 8-9, 15 and 19 which include similar but not identical features to those of claim 1, are submitted to patentably distinguish over Shigehashi in view of Blankenship for at least similar reasons to those of claim 1.

Claims 3-7, 10-14, 16-18, 20-29 and 31

Claims 3-7, 10-14, 16-18, 20-29 and 31, which include all of the limitations of their respective independent claims, are submitted to patentably distinguish over Shigehashi in view of Blankenship for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims.

Rejection of Claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, at page 10, claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigehashi in view of Blankenship in further view of Odaohhara (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0144160).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 30, which includes all of the limitations of claim 1, is submitted to patentably distinguish over Shigehashi in view of Blankenship for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

The addition of Odaohhara does not overcome the deficiencies of Shigehashi in view of Blankenship. This is because, Odaohhara does not disclose or suggest "the router status information including at least line status information indicating the status of a respective physical link of the external networks to the respective router device ...," as required by claim 1. Odaohhara, which is used the Examiner to teach that line status information further includes battery capacity information that indicates a remaining battery capacity of a respective router

device such that the calculated priorities are based on the line status information and the remaining battery capacity of the respective router device, is silent regarding anything related to a respective physical link of the external networks to the respective router device. Instead, Odaohhara discloses an electric power unit with a battery and an information storage that stores capacity information denoting a total capacity of the battery, as well as compensation information for denoting the total capacity of the battery with respect to the number of cycles and for compensating the capacity information. (See Odaohhara at paragraph [0014].) That is, Odaohhara is concerned with the tracking of remaining battery capacity for a computer system. Odaoharra, however, does not discuss the use of information relating to respective physical links of an external network and, more particularly, the use of such information regarding the respective physical links of the external networks to calculate priorities to decide whether a respective router device is to have an operational status.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 31 patentably distinguishes over Shagehashi and Blankenship in further view of Odaoharra for at least the above-mentioned reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the claim amendments and remarks, Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorney for Applicants

EB/nm

Dated: February 8, 2008

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

NM246967